

E 459
.H66

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



00006138780







Commandery of the State of
Missouri

Military Order of the Loyal Legion

APRIL 6, 1912

“LEST WE FORGET”

BY

COMPANION CAPTAIN WILLIAM R. HODGES



WOODWARD & TIERNAN PRINTING COMPANY
SAINT LOUIS

E459

.H66

Gift
Publisher
JUN 7 1912

W. S. 26 Aug 12

Comparatively few of the men who fought on either side during the mighty conflict from 1861 to 1865 had a clear comprehension of the real issues involved. We of the North would have spurned the idea that in reality we were fighting to exterminate slavery; while the poor whites of the South, who formed most of the armies of the Confederacy, would have as indignantly denied that they were fighting solely for its preservation. They failed utterly to recognize the fact that it was a slaveholders' war, instigated by an aristocratic oligarchy which degraded labor to menial service and closed the avenues of advancement to those outside of their own class, as we failed to recognize that Union was impossible until slavery was extinguished. It has taken nearly half a century for us of the North to realize the astounding fact that a few hundred thousand slaveholders practically dominated this nation from the adoption of the Constitution down to the inauguration of Abraham Lincoln as President in 1861. As we study the political history of our country the most surprising fact of all was the complacent subserviency of the Northern people in submitting to their arrogant demands, often accompanied by threats of secession, until the enactment of the fugitive slave law of 1850, and its interpretation by a pro-slavery Supreme Court in 1857, roused the dormant self-respect of the Northern people to meet the issue, "all slave or all free," which, although as I have said, we did not realize it at the time, was really the issue in the Presidential campaign of 1860.

Alexander H. Stephens was the most far-sighted statesman of the South, and in attempting to stem the tide of secession, which he foresaw could only bring disaster, pointed to the fact that they had practically ruled the nation and could continue to do so by remaining in the Union. In the Georgia Secession Convention, January 31, 1861, he spoke as follows: "This step once taken can never be recalled, and all the baleful and withering consequence that must follow will rest on this convention for all coming time. When we and our posterity shall see our beloved South desolated by the demon of war, which this act of yours will inevitably invite and call forth; when our green fields of waving harvest shall be trodden down by the murderous soldiery, and the fiery car of war sweeping over our land; our temples of justice laid in ashes; all the horrors and desolation of war upon us; who but this convention will be held responsible for it? and who but him who shall have given his vote for this unwise and ill-timed measure, as I honestly think and believe, shall be held to strict account for this suicidal act by the present generation, and probably cursed and execrated by posterity for all coming time, for the wide and desolating ruin that will inevitably follow this act you now propose to perpetrate.

"Pause, I entreat you, and consider for a moment what reason you can give that will even satisfy yourselves in calmer moments—what reason you can give to your fellow-sufferers in the calamity that it will bring upon us? What reason you can give to the nations of the earth to justify it? They will be the calm and deliberate judges in the case. To what cause or one overt act can you name or point, on which to rest the plea of Justification? What right has the North assailed? What interests of the South have been invaded? What justice has been denied? What claim founded in justice and right has been withheld? Can

either of you today name one government act of wrong, deliberately and purposely done by the government at Washington, of which the South has a right to complain? I challenge the answer!

"On the other hand, let me show the facts of which I wish you to judge, and I will only state facts which are clear and undeniable, and which now stand as records authentic in the history of our country. Believe me, gentlemen, I am not here the advocate of the North; but I am here the friend, the firm friend and lover of the South and her institutions, and for this reason I speak thus plainly and faithfully for your, mine and every other man's interest, the words of truth and soberness.

"When we of the South demanded the slave trade, or the importation of Africans for the cultivation of our lands, did they not yield the right for twenty years? When we asked a three-fifths representation in Congress for our slaves, was it not granted? When we asked and demanded the return of any fugitive from justice, or the recovery of those persons owing labor or allegiance, was it not incorporated in the Constitution, and again ratified and strengthened in the fugitive slave law of 1850?

"But, do you reply that in many instances they have violated this compact and have not been faithful to their engagements? As individuals and local communities they have done so, but not by the sanction of the Government for that has always been true to Southern interests. Again, gentlemen, look at another fact. When we have asked that more territory should be added, that we might spread the institution of slavery, have they not yielded to our demands in giving us Louisiana, Florida and Texas, out of which four States have been carved, and ample territory for four more to be added in due time? If you, by this unwise and impolitic act, do not destroy this hope, and perhaps by it lose all and have your last slave wrenched from you by stern military rule, as in South America and Mexico, or the vindictive decree of emancipation which may reasonably be expected to follow.

"But again, gentlemen, what have we to gain by this proposed change of our relation to the General Government? We have always had the control of it, and can yet, if we remain in it, and are as united as we have been. We have had a majority of the Presidents chosen from the South, as well as the control and management of most of those chosen from the North. We have had sixty years of Southern Presidents to their twenty-four, thus controlling the executive department. So of the Judges of the Supreme Court, we have had eighteen from the South, and but eleven from the North; although nearly four-fifths of the judicial business has arisen in the free States, yet a majority of the Court has always been from the South. *This we have required so as to guard against any interpretation of the Constitution unfavorable to us.* In like manner we have been equally watchful to guard our interests in the legislative branch of the Government. In choosing the Presidents pro tem of the Senate, we have had twenty-four to their eleven; Speakers of the House, we have had twenty-three and they twelve. While the majority of the Representatives, from their greater population, have always been from the North, yet we have so generally secured the Speaker, because he, to a great extent, shapes and controls the legislation of the country. Nor have we had less control in every other department of the General Government. Attorney Generals we have had fourteen, while the North has had but five. Foreign ministers we have had eighty-six, and they but fifty-four. While three-fourths of the business which demands diplomatic agents abroad is clearly from the free States, from their greater commercial interests, yet we have had the principal Embassies so as to secure the world markets for our cotton, tobacco and sugar

on the best possible terms. We have had a vast majority of the higher officers of both the army and navy, while a larger proportion of the soldiers were drawn from the North. Equally so of clerks, auditors and comptrollers filling the executive; the records show for the last fifty years that of the three thousand thus employed we have had more than two-thirds, while we have but one-third of the white population of the republic.

"Leaving out of view, for the present, the countless millions of dollars you must expend in a war with the North; with tens of thousands of your sons and brothers slain in battle and offered up as sacrifices upon the altar of your ambition—and for what, we ask again? Is it for the overthrow of the American Government, established by our common ancestry, cemented and built up by their sweat and blood and founded on the broad principles of right, justice and humanity? And, as such, I must declare here, as I have often done before and which has been repeated by the greatest and wisest of statesmen and patriots in this and other lands, that it is the best and freest Government—the most equal in its right—the most just in its decisions—the most lenient in its measures, and the most inspiring in its principles to elevate the race of men, that the sun of Heaven ever shone upon.

"Now, for you to attempt to overthrow such a Government as this, under which we have lived for more than three-quarters of a century—in which we have gained our wealth, our standing as a nation, our domestic safety while the elements of peril were around us, with peace and tranquility accompanied with unbounded prosperity and rights unassailed—is the height of madness, folly and wickedness to which I can neither lend my sanction nor my vote."

Concessions were made to slaveholders from the very beginning of the Nation. Jefferson, in the original draft of the Declaration of Independence, in the indictment of King George III, used the following language: "He has waged cruel war against human nature itself, violating the most sacred rights of life and liberty in the persons of distant people who never offended him, captivating and carrying them into slavery in another hemisphere, or to incur miserable death in the transportation thither, * * * determined to keep an open market where men should be bought and sold; he has prostituted his negative for suppressing every legislative attempt to prohibit or restrain this execrable commerce." At the demand of Georgia and South Carolina, this part of the indictment was struck out. Washington was in full sympathy with Jefferson, who held abhorrence of slavery, although a slave owner himself. At a Fairfax County Convention at which he presided, before the Revolution, it was resolved that "no slaves ought to be imported into any of the British Colonies," and Washington "expressed the most earnest wish to see an entire stop forever put to such a wicked, cruel and unnatural trade." The invention of the cotton gin in 1793, made the cultivation of cotton by slave labor highly profitable, and the same year Congress enacted a fugitive slave law which required State magistrates, who held office solely by State law, to sit in judgment in fugitive slave cases, and to aid in returning to slavery negroes claimed as slaves by owners from foreign States. In 1807 the United States prohibited the importation of slaves into any of the States, and in 1820 slavetraders were declared pirates and punishable as such. A "Declaration against the Slave Trade" of the world was signed at the Congress of the Powers at Vienna in 1815, and repeated by the Congress of Paris at the end of the Napoleonic Wars. The same year at the Treaty of Ghent it was declared by Great Britain and the United States, that: "Whereas, the traffic in slaves is irreconcilable with the principles of humanity and justice," the two countries stipulated to use their best endeavors to abolish it. The extension of slave

territory increased the demand for slaves and there was a revival of the slave trade. It was principally carried on in vessels under the United States flag, and the right of search was denied to foreign vessels engaged in suppressing it. The fact that the navy had been under the control of the slave power almost continuously from the adoption of the Constitution may account for the fact stated by DuBois in his History of the Slave Trade, that during eighteen months of the years 1859-60 eighty-five slavers are reported to have been fitted out in New York harbor, and that these alone transported from 30,000 to 60,000 slaves annually to America.

The first threats of disunion if slavery were interfered with came from the delegate from Missouri when during the session of 1818-1819 application was made for admission of Missouri as a slave State, and Mr. Tallmadge of New York offered to amend the bill by providing that all children born in the State after its admission should be free at twenty-five years of age. A fierce contest ensued which finally resulted in a proviso or compromise prohibiting slavery north of 36° 30' in the Louisiana acquisition except in Missouri. Jefferson realized what compromise with the spirit of aggression of the slave power meant in the future and he wrote: "This momentous question, like a fire bell in the night, awakened and filled me with terror. I considered it the knell of the Union." Clay, writing of the heated debate, said: "The words Civil War and disunion are uttered almost without emotion."

In November, 1832, a convention of the people of South Carolina was held and an ordinance was passed declaring the tariff acts of Congress "null and void," not binding on the State, and that under them no duties should be paid in the State after February 1, 1833. Medals were struck inscribed "John C. Calhoun, first President of the Southern Confederacy." President Jackson called it treason and prepared to enforce the law and incidentally to hang Mr. Calhoun if resistance were offered. As they knew that he meant what he said the nullification ordinance was repealed. The virus of secession remained until burned out by the fires of Civil War. When Sam Houston's Republic of Texas applied for admission to the Union as a slave State, and with a constitution prohibiting the emancipation of slaves, and authorized their importation into Texas, there was mild protest, but it was finally agreed that new States lying north of latitude 36° 30' should be admitted without slavery, which satisfied the Northern "Dough Faces," and Texas was admitted. It was afterwards found that the northern boundary of Texas was not within 200 miles of 36° 30'. The war with Mexico was brought on solely to acquire more slave territory, but by a fortunate combination of circumstances not a foot of the acquired territory was ever polluted by slavery. After General Taylor was made President his Southern friends demanded his aid to plant slavery in California, but he declined and declared that California should be free.

The struggle in Congress over the disposition of the Territory of Nebraska culminated in the series of events which led to the formation of the Republican party, the election of Mr. Lincoln and secession. This territory embraced at that time what is now the States of Kansas, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, Montana and parts of Colorado and Wyoming.

Senator Stephen A. Douglas, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Territories, opened a veritable Pandora box of evil portent by making a report embodying new constitutional theories and reopening questions supposed to have been settled. It stated in brief "That the Constitution secures to every citizen an inalienable right to move into any of the territories with his property, of whatever kind and description, and to hold and enjoy the same under the sanction of the law." A bill

accompanying the report required that any part of the Nebraska Territory admitted as a State "shall be received with or without slavery as its Constitution may prescribe at the time of admission." This was a practical abrogation of the Missouri Compromise, but to leave no question, he presented a substitute for his original bill wherein it was provided that the restriction of that compromise "was superseded by the principles of the legislation of 1850, and is hereby declared inoperative." After a long and fierce struggle the bill passed and was approved by the President in May, 1854. In January, 1854, an "Appeal of the Independent Democrats in Congress to the People of the United States" was published, signed by S. P. Chase, Charles Sumner, J. R. Giddings, Edward Wade, Gerritt Smith, and Alexander De Witt, which declared that the new Nebraska bill would "open all the unorganized territories of the Union to the progress of slavery," and a plot to convert them "into a dreary region of despotism, inhabited by masters and slaves to the exclusion of emigrants from the Old World and free laborers from our own States." The Northern people were at last thoroughly aroused. It was realized that a new party must be formed with the distinctive purpose of resisting the further aggressions of slavery. A meeting of citizens of all parties was held at Ripon, Wisconsin, where I lived at the beginning of the war and from whence I entered the service. The name suggested was "Republican." A few weeks afterwards a convention was held at Jackson, Michigan, and the Republican party was formally launched upon the ocean of national politics. Before the convention adjourned a full State ticket was nominated. Three of the candidates were Free-soilers, five were Whigs, and two Anti-Nebraska Democrats. State conventions were held in Wisconsin, Vermont, Ohio and Indiana. The Anti-Nebraska Peoples' party carried Ohio by 75,000 majority and elected every representative to Congress, they also carried Indiana by 13,000 majority. In New York the same party elected 27 out of a total of 33 representatives in Congress. Subservience to the slave power which had hitherto dominated the Nation was at an end.

It is well that we should now have a definite understanding of the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850. I quote from General Keifer's "Slavery and Four Years of War": "United States commissioners were provided to act instead of State magistrates, on whom jurisdiction was attempted to be conferred by the act of 1793. *Ex parte* testimony was made sufficient to determine the identity of the negro claimed, and the affidavit of an agent or attorney was made sufficient. The alleged fugitive was not permitted under any circumstances to testify. He was denied the right of trial by jury. The cases were to be heard in a summary manner. The claimant was authorized to use all necessary force to remove the fugitive adjudged a slave. All process of any court or judge was forbidden to molest the claimant, his agent or attorney, in carrying away the adjudged slave. United States Marshals and their deputies were authorized to summon bystanders as a *posse comitatus*; and all good citizens were commanded, by the act, to aid and assist in the proper and efficient execution of the law; all under heavy penalty for failing to do so. The officers were liable, in a civil suit, for the value of the negro if he escaped. Heavy fine and imprisonment was to be imposed for hindering or preventing the arrest, or for rescuing or attempting to rescue, or for harboring or concealing the fugitive, and, if any person was found guilty of causing his escape, a further fine of \$1,000 by way of civil damages to the owner. In case the commissioner adjudged the negro was the claimant's slave, his fee was fixed at \$10.00, and if he discharged the negro it was only \$5.00. The claimant had a right, in case of apprehended danger, to require the officer arresting the fugitive to remove him to the State whence he fled, with authority to employ as many

persons to aid him as he might deem necessary, the expense to be paid out of the United States Treasury."

On March 6, 1857, two days after Buchanan was inaugurated President, the famous Dred Scott decision was rendered by Chief Justice Taney of Maryland, and concurred in by Justices Wayne of Georgia, Catron of Tennessee, Daniel of Virginia, Campbell of Alabama, Grier of Pennsylvania, and Nelson of New York. Justices McLean of Ohio, and Curtis of Massachusetts, dissented on all points. I will quote two paragraphs of the decision: "The Constitution of the United States recognizes slaves as property, and pledges the Federal Government to protect it. And Congress can not exercise any more authority over property of that description than it may constitutionally exercise over property of any other kind." "The act of Congress, therefore, prohibiting a citizen of the United States from taking with him his slaves when he removes to the territory in question to reside, is an exercise of authority over private property which is not warranted by the Constitution—and the removal of the plaintiff, by his owner, to that territory, gave him no title to freedom." Of this it has been said, "Thus the highest and most august judicial tribunal of this country pronounced doctrines abhorrent to the age, overthrowing the acts and practices of the fathers and framers of the Republic, and pronouncing the Ordinance of 1787, in so far as it restricted human slavery, and all like enactments as from the beginning, *unconstitutional*. The court invaded the express powers of Congress granted to it by the Constitution respecting the "Territory or other property belonging to the United States." It set aside the Ordinance of 1787, which was re-enacted by the First Congress under the Constitution, and its slavery restriction clause was enforced, without question by Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe and Jackson and their administrations. Also the Missouri Compromise which had stood unassailed for more than a third of a century Polk and his Cabinet approved the Oregon bill prohibiting slavery, and Pierce and his administration approved the extension of the same prohibition over Washington Territory. The pro-slavery Supreme Court, selected, as Mr. Stephens declared, "to guard against any interpretation of the Constitution unfavorable to us," clothed only with judicial power, entered the political field, and attempted to read into the Constitution the theory promulgated by John C. Calhoun, that Congress had no power to exclude slavery from the territories. If as this decision states "the Constitution of the United States recognizes slaves as property, and pledges the Federal Government to protect it," why should not the slaveholders' property be protected in Massachusetts or Illinois as well as in the territories? It is true that such a theory was not promulgated, but if demanded by the slave power, a pliant court would so decide.

This was foreshadowed by Mr. Lincoln in his memorable speech at Springfield in September, 1858. He said: "If we could first know where we are and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it. We are now far into the fifth year since a policy was initiated with the avowed object, and confident promise, of putting an end to slavery agitation. Under the operation of that policy, that agitation has not only not ceased, but has constantly augmented. In my opinion, it will not cease until a crisis shall have been reached and passed. A house divided against itself can not stand. I believe this government can not endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved—I do not expect the house to fall—but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction, or its advo-

cates will push it forward till it shall become alike lawful in all States, old as well as new, North as well as South."

President Buchanan was completely under the influence of the slave power. The admission of Kansas was a burning issue and Buchanan did all in his power to foist a fraudulent Constitution adopted by a rump convention of slaveholders from Missouri upon the people of that territory.

Mr. Douglas refused to be a party to the scheme and denounced it severely in the Senate chamber. Buchanan was furious at the stand taken by Douglas and said to him: "Mr. Douglas, I desire you to remember that no Democrat ever yet differed from an administration of his own choice without being crushed." Douglas replied in an emphatic manner: "Mr. President, I wish you to remember that General Jackson is dead."

It is almost impossible at this time, nearly half a century after the emancipation proclamation, when slavery is universally admitted to be a monstrous wrong, degrading both to master and slaves, to realize that all over the North the word Abolitionist was a term of vile reproach. That the public expression of anti-slavery sentiments was met with howlings, revilings and rotten eggs. In 1832, Elijah P. Lovejoy, a young Congregational minister, came to St. Louis from Maine and established an Orthodox Protestant newspaper. He published something to the effect that intemperance and slavery were not conducive to godliness. As a consequence his establishment was destroyed and he was driven from the city. He located at Alton and made public the same sentiments. He was told to move on, and failing to do so his presses were a second time destroyed by a mob. He resolved to renew his establishment, and with a few friends stood to arms to defend his right of free speech and his property, when he was shot dead by pro-slavery ruffians. No merited justice was ever meted out to his murderers, nor restitution for his property to his family. Posterity erected a monument to his memory. It is a conservative estimate when I say that scarcely more than one person out of a thousand in the North was an aggressive abolitionist, one who favored the abolition of slavery at all hazards. There was no disposition to meddle with the system in the slave States. They had conceded to the South a representation in the House of Representatives based on three-fifths of their slaves, but the time had come when they proposed that no more slave States should be made from the territories.

Ruffianism was rampant during the discussion of the Kansas-Nebraska bill. Charles Sumner made a powerful and intensely bitter speech in the Senate, entitled "The Crime Against Kansas." He made a stinging reference to South Carolina and Senator Butler from that State for championship of human wrongs. I quote from "Rhode's History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850": "Two days after this exciting debate (May 22) when the Senate at the close of a short session adjourned, Sumner remained in the chamber, occupied in writing letters. Becoming deeply engaged, he drew his armchair close to his desk, bent over his writing, and while in this position was approached by Brooks, a representative from South Carolina and a kinsman of Senator Butler. Brooks, standing before and directly over him, said: "I have read your speech over twice carefully. It is a libel on South Carolina and Mr. Butler, who is a relative of mine." As he pronounced the last word, he hit Sumner on the head with his cane with the force that a dragoon would give to a sabre blow. Sumner was more than six feet in height and of powerful frame, but penned under his desk he could offer no resistance, and Brooks continued the blows on his defenseless head. The cane broke, but the South Carolinian went on beating the victim with the butt. The first

blows stunned and blinded Sumner, but instinctively and with powerful effort he wrenched the desk from its fastenings, stood up, and with spasmodic and widely directed efforts attempted unavailingly to protect himself. Brooks took hold of him, and, while he was reeling and staggering about, struck him again and again. The assailant did not desist until his arm was seized by one who rushed to the spot to stop the assault. At that moment Sumner, reeling, staggered backwards and sideways, fell to the floor bleeding profusely and covered with blood." It was more than three years before Sumner was able to resume his seat in the Senate. At the North, the assault was denounced as brutal and cowardly. At the South, Brooks was lauded as a hero. On a vote of expulsion from the House but one Southerner voted in the affirmative. Senator Wilson, Sumner's colleague, said in the Senate: "Sumner was stricken down on this floor by a brutal, murderous and cowardly assault." Butler cried: "You are a liar." Brooks challenged Wilson to a duel, which Wilson declined in a dignified letter, repeating the words he had used. Burlingame of Massachusetts, denounced the assault in the House, and he, too, was challenged by Brooks. Burlingame promptly accepted the challenge, and Canada was named as the place of meeting. This Brooks declined, claiming that he would not be permitted to reach Canada in safety. At one time several Northern Representatives and Senators made a compact that the next time one of them was insulted they would carry the quarrel to a coffin. Potter of Wisconsin accepted a challenge and named bowie knives as the weapons. The challenger declined the terms as unchivalrous.

The free States had 176 electoral votes, while the slave States had but 120, when Fremont was nominated in 1856 with great enthusiasm, it seemed not improbable that he might carry every non-slave-holding State. The cry of disunion was at once raised. Fillmore said in a speech at Albany: "We are treading upon the brink of a volcano that is liable to burst forth at any moment and overwhelm the Nation." Senator Toombs wrote: "The election of Fremont would be the end of the Union, and ought to be." Governor Wise of Virginia, wrote: "Fremont's election would bring about a dissolution of the American Confederacy of States, inevitably." Senator Slidell, a trusted friend of Buchanan, wrote: "I do not hesitate to declare that if Fremont be elected the Union can not and ought not to be preserved." Senator Mason said that in such an event "but one course remains for the South—immediate, absolute, eternal separation." Northern men like Fillmore and Choate sounded the alarm and no doubt the fear of disunion had a powerful influence upon timid voters and contributed to the election of Buchanan.

Immediately after the inauguration of Buchanan as President came the Dred Scott decision. The extension of slavery into the territories became the issue. The people of the North refused to accept the doctrines of Calhoun as enunciated by the pro-slavery Supreme Court. Abraham Lincoln was nominated upon a platform which pronounced against interference with slavery in the States, and at the same time declared "That the new dogma that the Constitution, of its own force, carries slavery into any or all of the territories of the United States, is a dangerous political heresy, at variance with the explicit provisions of that instrument itself. That the normal condition of all the territory of the United States is that of freedom—and we deny the authority of Congress, or a Territorial Legislature, or of any individuals, to give legal existence to slavery in any territory of the United States."

Of the 303 electoral votes cast in 1860 Lincoln received 180, Douglas 12, Breckinridge 72 and Bell 39, giving Lincoln 57 over all. It was thus decreed that there

could be no further extension of slavery. Foreseeing the result, the Legislature of South Carolina was convened by proclamation of the Governor on November 5th, the day preceding the Presidential election. The first important step taken by the Legislature was to appropriate \$100,000 to be expended by the Governor in the purchase of small arms and a battery of rifled cannon. On the 20th of December a convention held at Columbia passed an ordinance of secession. A like ordinance was passed on January 8th, by Alabama, by Mississippi on the 9th, by Georgia on the 19th, by Louisiana on the 25th, and by Texas on February 24th. The people of North Carolina voted down a convention to consider the question of secession, but the Legislature called a convention which on May 21st passed an Ordinance of Secession without submitting it to a vote of the people. Other States followed.

Among the members of Buchanan's Cabinet were John B. Floyd, Secretary of War, who transferred 115,000 muskets from Northern arsenals to the South, besides cannon and other military stores, to be promptly seized by the secession authorities, Howell Cob, Secretary of the Treasury, chosen presiding officer of the First Confederate Congress, Jacob Thompson, Secretary of the Interior, afterwards charged with promoting a plot to free Confederate prisoners and to burn New York and other Northern cities. The President in his annual message December 4, 1860, while not conceding the right of secession, declared that "the Constitution had not delegated to Congress the power to coerce a State into submission which is attempting to withdraw, or has actually withdrawn from the Confederacy." He suggested an amendment to the Constitution, to recognize the right of property in slaves in the States where it existed; to protect this right in the territories until they were admitted with or without slavery; a recognition of the right of the master to have his escaped slave delivered up to him, and declaring all unfriendly State laws impairing this right, unconstitutional. I now record the most humiliating fact in the political history of our country. A proposed amendment to the Constitution was actually adopted by a two-thirds vote of both Houses, as follows: "No amendment shall be made to the Constitution which will authorize or give to Congress the power to abolish or interfere, within any State, with the domestic institutions thereof, including that of persons held to labor or service by the laws of any State." It was thus proposed to establish slavery forever by extinguishing all power to abolish or interfere with it. Could abject subserviency to the slave power go further? It should be remembered that this action was taken after the secession of South Carolina and the appropriation of \$100,000 to purchase arms.

After the inauguration of Mr. Lincoln came the assault upon Fort Sumter and actual war. It is due to ourselves and to our children that the facts of history should not be distorted. That our foes were the bravest of the brave we freely admit, but that the Union was saved entirely by brute force and overwhelming numbers we deny, and the verdict of history will sustain the contention.

General Grant, in his Memoirs, written as he calmly awaited death at Mount McGregor, said: "There has always been a great conflict of opinion as to the number of troops engaged in every battle, or all important battles, fought between the sections, the South magnifying the number of the Union troops engaged and belittling their own. Northern writers have fallen, in many instances, into the same error. I have often heard gentlemen, who were thoroughly loyal to the Union, speak of what a splendid fight the South had made and successfully continued for four years before yielding, with their twelve million people against our twenty, and of the twelve, four being colored slaves, non-combatants. I will add to their argument. We had many regiments of brave and loyal men, who volun-

teered under great difficulty from the twelve million belonging to the South. But the South had rebelled against the National Government. It was bound by no constitutional restrictions. The whole South was a military camp. The occupation of the colored people was to furnish supplies for the army. Conscription was resorted to early, and embraced every male from the age of 18 to 45, excluding only those physically unfit to serve in the field, and the necessary number of civil officers of State and intended national government. The old and physically disabled furnished a good portion of these. The slaves, the non-combatants, one-third of the whole, were required to work in the field without regard to sex, and almost without regard to age. Children from the age of eight years could and did handle the hoe; they were not much older when they began to handle the plough. The four million of colored non-combatants were equal to more than three times their number in the North, age for age, and sex for sex, in supplying food from the soil to support armies. Women did not work in the fields in the North, and children attended school. In the South no opposition was allowed to the government which had been set up and which would have become real and respected if the rebellion had been successful. No rear had to be protected, all troops in service could be brought to the front to contest every inch of ground threatened with invasion. The press of the South, like the people who remained at home, were loyal to the Southern cause. In the North the press was free up to the point of open treason. The citizen could entertain his views and express them. Troops were necessary in the Northern States to prevent prisoners from the Southern Army from being released by outside force, armed and set at large to destroy by fire our Northern cities. Plans were formed by Northern and Southern citizens to burn our cities, to poison the water supplying them, to spread infection by importing clothing from infested regions, to blow up our river and lake streams—regardless of the destruction of innocent lives. The copperhead disreputable portion of the press magnified rebel successes and belittled those of the Union Army. It was with a large following, an auxiliary to the Confederate Army. The North would have been much stronger with a hundred thousand of these men in the Confederate ranks and the rest of their kind thoroughly subdued, as the Union sentiment was in the South, than we were as the battle was fought. As I have said, the whole South was a military camp. The colored people, four million in number, were submissive, and worked in the field and took care of the families while the able-bodied white men were at the front fighting for a cause destined to defeat. The cause was popular, and was enthusiastically supported by the young men. The conscription took all of them. Before the war was over, further conscription took those between 18 and 14 years of age as junior reserves, and those between 45 and 60 as senior reserves. It would have been an offense, directly after the war, and perhaps it would be now, to ask any able-bodied man in the South, who was between the ages of 14 and 60 at any time during the war whether he had been in the Confederate Army. He would assert that he had, or account for his absence from the ranks. Under such circumstances it is hard to conceive how the North should have such a superiority in force in every battle fought. I know they did not. It is safe to say that more than half the National Army was engaged in guarding lines of supplies, or were on leave, sick or in hospital, or on detail which prevented their bearing arms. Then, again, large forces were employed where no Confederate Army confronted them. I deem it safe to say that there were no large engagements where the National numbers compensated for the advantage of position and entrenchment occupied by the enemy."

On the Confederate monument at Austin, Texas, is the following inscription, giving the strength of the Federal and Confederate Armies:

Number of Men Enlisted.	
In Confederate Armies.....	600,000
In Federal Armies.....	2,859,132

Losses from all Causes.	
Confederate	437,000
Federal	485,216

It appears that the above statement of the Confederate forces engaged is based upon an estimate by Dr. Joseph Jones, a Confederate surgeon, who in 1869 published a pamphlet in which he said: "The available Confederate force, capable of active service in the field, did not during the entire war exceed 600,000." He qualifies this with the statement that his "calculation is only an approximation." This estimate has apparently been accepted by the Southern people as a demonstrated historical fact, inscribed upon their monuments and taught in histories to their children. As the military population of the seceding States according to the census of 1860 was nearly 1,000,000—that is, between the ages of eighteen and forty-five—and this number was largely augmented during the four years by boys reaching the military age, they evidently fail to appreciate the reflection upon the patriotism and manhood of the South implied by such an estimate. We who met Southern men on the battlefield know that they did not in great numbers shirk military duty or skulk in swamps to avoid conscription, but that they manfully took their places in the ranks and fought with heroic bravery to the bitter end.

In 1900 Colonel Thomas L. Livermore, an able, fair-minded historical student, published a book from official and all other available sources, showing the strength and losses of both armies, and I believe that his conclusions are substantially correct. He gives in round numbers the total of those living in 1861 in the seceded States, according to the United States Census reports of 1860, who came within the terms of the conscription acts, as 1,269,000. After adding the male whites from 10 to 12 years who became liable to conscription during the four years, and making deductions for exemptions for all causes, he estimates the numbers as regularly enrolled and who took up arms and served in the Confederate Army as 1,234,000. Those who escaped service in North Carolina and Tennessee were offset against those who joined the Confederate Army from the border States. He gives the number on a basis of three years' service as 1,082,119; number of enlistments in the Union Army, *i. e.*, names on the rolls, 2,898,304. Of this number probably 90 per cent of the 91,816 three months men, who enlisted in April, 1861, re-enlisted and were counted twice. Over 200,000 re-enlisted in veteran regiments, the Veteran Reserve Corps and Hancock's Veteran Corps, and were counted twice and many three times. There were 120,000 emergency men and militia called out in 1863, who served from two to three weeks. There were 1,580,000 whose term of service was from two weeks to fourteen months. Reduced to a three years basis, the number in the Union Army was 1,556,678. There were more than 100,000 enlistments in the Union Army of boys of 15 years and younger.

A critical study of the various campaigns of the war will fully justify the conclusion of General Grant "that there were no large engagements where the National number compensated for the advantage of position and entrenchment occupied by the enemy." In bravery there was no superiority on either side, and the respect resulting from the demonstration of this fact has been most potent in the elimination of bitterness between the two sections.

The inevitable conflict, unprecedented in magnitude and destructiveness, ensued. As Mr. Stephens foretold, the South was desolated by the demon of war, her fields of waving harvest were trodden down by the foe, her temples of justice laid in ashes, but there has survived a fairer, more prosperous South. In our campaigns we saw millions of acres of worn-out, abandoned land. Intelligent agriculture has taken the place of the wasteful methods of slavery days, free labor is more profitable than that of slavery. The bone of contention has been removed. The paradox of our republic proclaiming freedom to mankind and standing alone among the nations in legalizing and upholding slavery, no longer exists. We did not realize at the time that slavery was the real issue, but it was that which brought thousands of foreigners to fight in our ranks. It was a realization of this fact which impelled the men, who, years ago, in the presence of many companions of the Loyal Legion and comrades of the Grand Army of the Republic, to dedicate at Edinburgh, Scotland, a magnificent bronze statue of Abraham Lincoln, on the base of which is the figure of a slave with broken shackles, and upon the pedestal the inscription, "Erected by Scotchmen who served in the Armies of the United States for the preservation of the Union, 1861-65." It was this that caused the great mass of the English people, including thousands of workers in the cotton mills of Manchester, starving though they were, to remain steadfast in their sympathy for the Union cause, although the aristocracy hoped to see the Union destroyed.

Another war has been waged, not of conquest, but in the interest of human liberty. As a result, possessions beyond the sea have fallen to us. We retain them, not for exploitation, but for the betterment of their people; and when the time shall come that they are competent for self-government, it will be given them, as it was to the Cubans. We have thus instituted a policy of altruism hitherto unknown in diplomacy, which will, let us hope, supplant the old rule of savagery that "might makes right." Deep in our hearts should we be thankful that we contributed as best we could to save our beloved republic for so glorious a destiny.

Great problems here as elsewhere remain to be solved, but the toilsome evolution of the race is towards ultimate justice, and those of us who were so fortunate as to participate in the momentous events of the last half century, may, as we descend to the land of shadows, see in the horizon of the future the glow of brighter days for humanity.



